

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this patent application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected as being anticipated by Brazell II under 35 USC 102; Claims 8-21 have been rejected as being anticipated by Porter et al. under 35 USC 102; and Claims 1 and 8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Porter et al. in view of Brazell II under 35 USC 103. Claims 1,3,5,8,10,12,15,17, and 19 have been cancelled, new Claims 22-24 inserted, and consequently, Claims 2,4,6,7,9,11, 13,14,16,18, and 20-24 are now active in this patent application.

The interview granted by Examiner Tyler is hereby

acknowledged and sincerely appreciated as a means for expediting the prosecution of this patent application toward allowance. During the course of the interview, new Claims 22-24 were fully discussed in light of the prior art of record, and it was agreed that such new claims patentably defined over such prior art in that, for example, while Brazell II admittedly discloses ball bearings 26,27, there is disclosed only a single seal member 31 disposed only upon one side of the ball bearings 26,27.

To the contrary, the present invention comprises a pair of rotary seal members 44,46 which are disposed upon both opposite sides of the ball bearings 30 so as to prevent the ingress of external debris and hot melt adhesive from encountering the ball bearings, fouling the same, and effectively defeating the purpose of the ball bearings in providing relatively friction-free movement between the shaft and housing members. This structure is now recited within new Claims 22-24 and is clearly disclosed in the specification at Page 12, lines 6-16. It is also respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to incorporate a second seal member

within the system of Brazell II in view of the fact that there are no teachings set forth within Brazell II which would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to in fact incorporate such a second seal member into the system of Brazell II. Considered from another point of view, Brazell II apparently did not foresee the potential problem that exposure of the ball bearings 26,27, to the fluid flowing through the swivel connector body portions 11,12, could eventually foul the ball bearings 26,27 and effectively destroy the beneficial effects that the ball bearings 26,27 provide to the overall swivel joint assembly. This feature is precisely part of the overall swivel joint assembly as invented by applicant whereby the overall swivel joint assembly, as now claimed, patentably defines over Brazell II.

Remarks similar to those made above in connection with Brazell II are likewise applicable to Porter et al., it being noted that Porter et al. does not actually disclose any ball bearings, but to the contrary, simply discloses, or references, a swivel assembly 16 which could comprise, for example, a bearing member within a bearing block. Porter et al.

certainly does not teach a plurality of ball bearings upon opposite sides of which there is disposed a pair of rotary seal members for preventing the ingress of external debris and hot melt adhesive whereby the same would encountering the ball bearings and foul the same.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims of this patent application now patentably define over the prior art of record.

With respect to the objections to the drawings, the same were discussed and it was agreed that the drawings, as they presently are, are in fact satisfactory and proper. The supply hose and adhesive applicator are in fact illustrated, and no details of such components are being claimed or relied upon for patentability. It is also noted that a dispensing outlet has not been claimed.

A new Abstract is attached hereto upon a separate sheet in accordance with the Examiner's requirement.

As for the incorporation of the bold and capitalized words within the specification, it is respectfully submitted that such is in fact permitted in accordance with current Patent Office practice, and therefore, such wording within the specification has been retained. To satisfy the examiner with respect to the claims, however, such wording has been replaced without any bolding and with lower-case letters.

In a similar manner, the Examiner has objected to the incorporation within Claims 6,12, and 19 of the trademark names. Such claims have been cancelled, thereby disposing of this objection.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the

claims of this patent application now patentably define over the prior art of record, that all objections have been addressed and overcome whereby this patent application is in condition for allowance, and therefore, an early and favorable action to this effect is now anticipated and awaited.

It is lastly noted that this amendment is being filed within a period of time of one (1) month beyond the normal response due date, and therefore, a check in the amount of \$120.00 is attached hereto for the one (1) month extension of time fee for a one (1) month extension of time which is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
SCHWARTZ & WEINRIEB



Steven W. Weinrieb
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 26,520
(703) 415-1250